REMARKS

Claims 1, 10, 11, 12, 22, 26, 33, 39, 40-44 and 54 have been amended. Support for amendments to claim 10 can be found at pages 5-6 of the Specification. Claims 1-54 are now pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I.   REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-44, 46-49 AND 54 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101:

Independent claims 1, 10, 22, 33, 39, 40-44 and 54 have been amended to overcome the rejection.

II.   REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-9, 26-30, 41, 44-51 AND 53 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER EDLUND ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,546,388; HEREINAFTER "EDLUND") IN VIEW OF SUZUOKA ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 5,933,832; HEREINAFTER "SUZUOKA"):

The present invention, as recited in claim 1, for example, relates to a popularity degree calculation method for calculating a popularity degree indicating the height of a popularity of a document in a network via an apparatus connected with the network. The method comprising extracting documents updated or collected during a first time period, and calculating the popularity degree for one of the extracted documents based on a number of link relations of said particular one referencing to the other extracted documents and of said particular one referenced by the other extracted documents.

Edlund discloses a system and method of metadata search ranking utilizing a combination of popularity and/or relevancy to determine a search ranking for a given search result association (see the Abstract). Specifically, Edlund discloses determining a popularity vector by tracking the number of time a resource has been accessed with regard to a particular query. A statistic R is set to this number to represent the relevance of the resource (see column 7, lines 29-38). That is, Edlund defines a number derived from a number of users accesses as "popularity". Therefore, Edlund requires a means for storing log data of search result, such as Query Database shown in FIG. 1.

Further, Edlund discloses a relevancy calculator component which receives a list of search result items along with an associated content relevancy ranking and the relevancy calculator then queries the ranking database for each search result item to determine the value

of version adjusted popularity and document recency. The value of the content relevance is obtained, along with the value of the version adjusted popularity and the document recency (see column 8, lines 56-66).

In the present invention, it is not necessary to consider the number of user accesses because "popularities" are measured based on the number of links generated among the contents. And further, in the present invention, a change in a popularity measure can be determined by monitoring changes in linking relations among contents.

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Edlund fails to disclose "extracting documents updated or collected during a first time period". However, the Examiner asserts that Suzuoka discloses the deficiencies of Edlund.

Suzuoka discloses a retrieval system for frequently updated data distributed on a network whereby a page having a high data update frequency is a highly popular page and the data update frequency is used as a barometer for popularity (see column 4, lines 41-45).

However, neither Edlund nor Suzuoka, individually or combined, disclose "calculating the popularity degree for one of the extracted documents based on information about relations of said particular one referencing to the other extracted documents and of said particular one referenced by the other extracted documents," as recited in claim 1.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences of various other rejected claims over the cited reference. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Thus, the combination of Edlund and Suzuoka fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness over the claimed invention. Therefore, claims 1-9, 26-30, 41, 44-51 and 53 patentably distinguish over Edlund in view of Suzuoka. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. **REJECTION OF CLAIMS 10-17, 19-25, 31-40, 42, 43 AND 54 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER EDLUND IN VIEW OF MUKAI (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,446,095):**

Claim 10 has been amended to recite "...extracting a link relation from a first document, extracting a predetermined character string which links a second document in the first document, from the first document, and judging whether the second document is a non-text document related to contents of the first document".

Edlund at column 9, lines 25-32 discloses using a selected URL together with a most recent version of a document as a primary key to update the counter for the popularity of the most recent version of the URL associated with that document.

Further, Mukai at column 4, line 55 to column 5, line 21discloses a document gain means which gains documents of text and link data such as images and sounds stored in a document storage means. The documents and the data such as the images and the sounds which should be gained are designated by a user. A conditional storage means stores conditions for judging degrees of importance of data associated with each other by link information contained in the documents, based on user specifications.

Neither Edlund nor Mukai, individually or combined, disclose "...judging whether the second document is a non-text document related to contents of the first document," as recited in claim 10.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the teachings of Edlund and Mukai are fundamentally different from that of the claimed invention.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 10, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences of various other rejected claims over the cited reference. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Thus, the combination of Edlund and Mukai fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness over the claimed invention. Therefore, claims 10-17, 19-25, 31-40, 42, 43 and 54 patentably distinguish over Edlund in view of Mukai. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

IV.   REJECTION OF CLAIM 18 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER EDLUND IN VIEW OF MUKAI AND FURTHER IN VIEW OF PAGE (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,285,999):

The comments from section III are applicable here, since claim 18 depends from claim 10.

V.   CONCLUSION:

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore, defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of

allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _April 19, 2005_

By: _Deidre M. Davis_
Deidre M. Davis
Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501